

Poster – #EIE2021

Identification of ideal implementation-components and different positionings in implementation projects

Presenter: Jens H. Lund (VIA University College, Didactics of Professions Research Program) – Denmark

Research aim

To identify potentials and barriers in an ideal model of implementation-components used in the Danish school project “Space for differentness” and to identify project participants’ perceptions of implementation. Involved schools were implementing pedagogical methods for inclusion.

Methods

This project builds on a qualitative approach, including interviews, observations, and following the object.

Key findings

During the pilot period, the original ideal model for implementation components, which was planned to frame the project, was challenged. The adjusted model contains a categorical separation between problem definition and analytical processes on the one hand and processes of ‘actions’ with the implementation object on the other. A second categorical separation in the adjusted model points out the difference between two tracks of ‘actions’ with the implementation object (pedagogical methods). One track is ‘actions’ aiming at using or enacting the implementation object and the second track consists of ‘actions’ aiming at changing the conditions for using/enacting the implementation object.

During the research processes, it became relevant to identify project participants’ perceptions of implementation based on the concept of *positionings* and the limitations and possibilities of such positionings in the processes of implementation. The research on this topic identified four different positionings, which the participants draw on: (1) a political position (*somebody is wanting something from me - who has decided what and why?*); (2) a fidelity position (*it’s important that I do the right thing*); (3) a technical position (*here, I can get a problem solved*) and (4) a developmental position (*I am taking part in a developmental process*).

Discussion

Why develop models for implementation when their ‘power’ of meeting praxis of implementation-processes are so weak/depended on existing praxis? What are the potentials and pitfalls of inviting participators in implementation processes to analyse their own positioning and the possibilities of positionings in the implementation project?